

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEVIN VAN JACKSON,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION NO.
1:18-CR-0015-AT-3

ORDER


Currently before the Court is the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation ("R&R")(Doc. 125) on pending motions on behalf of Defendant Devin Van Jackson, including his Motion to Dismiss Count Four (Doc. 88) and his "Motion to Suppress the Fruit of the Search Warrant of His Abode and Any and All Statements Due to Fourth and Fifth Amendment Violations" (Doc. 89). The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Motion to Dismiss be denied without prejudice and that the Motion to Suppress be denied.

A district judge has broad discretion to accept, reject, or modify a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations. *United States v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 680 (1980). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court reviews any

portion of the R&R that is the subject of a proper objection on a de novo basis and any non-objected portion on a “clearly erroneous” standard. As Defendant has filed no objections to the R&R, the Court reviews the R&R for clear error.

Upon review of the R&R and the underlying motions, the Court finds no clear error in the R&R’s analysis or recommendations. Therefore, the Court adopts such as the Order of the Court. Thus, Devin Jackson’s Motion to Dismiss Count Four [Doc. 88] is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and his “Motion to Suppress the Fruit of the Search Warrant of His Abode and Any and All Statements Due to Fourth and Fifth Amendment Violations” [Doc. 89] is **DENIED**.

It is **SO ORDERED** this 6th day of December, 2018.



AMY TOTENBERG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE